

## **REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's withdrawal of the previous 112, first and second paragraph issues. Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's remaining objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

### **Claim Objections**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to Claim 23 for an informality therein. In response, Applicants are amending Claim 23 as follows: "...by applying a drop of [[the]] a liquid composition." This amendment should overcome the Examiner's objection.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

### **Specification Objections**

The Examiner also objects to the specification, and in particular, the paragraph bridging pages 19-20, for informalities therein.

In response, Applicants are amending this paragraph. This amendment should overcome the Examiner's objection.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph**

The Examiner rejects Claims 16, 16-17 and 23-30 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this

application, Applicants are amending Claim 17 to recite “wherein the plasma irradiation is performed at a pressure in a range of  $1.3 \times 10^1$  to  $1.31 \times 10^5$  Pa.” This amendment should overcome the objection to this claim.

With regard to independent Claims 23 and 26, Applicants are amending these claims to recite the feature of “forming a part of a first wiring by etching the first pattern having conductivity using the first mask pattern;” and the feature of “forming a part of a second wiring by etching the second pattern using the second mask pattern.” Applicants are also amending Claims 23 and 26 to recite “a first pattern having conductivity” and “a second pattern having conductivity.” These amendments should overcome the Examiner’s objections.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112, First Paragraph

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-6, 16-17 and 23-30 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, as explained herein, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending Claims 1, 2, 17, 23, and 26. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments overcome this rejection, and it is requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

## Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102/103

### Claims 1 and 3-4

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1 and 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Kiguchi et al. (US 6,599,582). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1 to recite the feature of “wherein a groove is formed in the first selected portion by irradiating the first selected portion with plasma.” This feature is supported by, for example, page 8, lines 20-22 in the specification and Fig. 2(B) in the present application.

In contrast, the Examiner appears to contend that the banks in Kiguchi correspond to a groove or hole. However, the banks in Kiguchi are *not* formed in a film on an insulating surface, as in Claim 1, but are formed on a substrate. Further, the banks in Kiguchi are formed on a substrate by using an application mechanism. Hence, Kiguchi does not disclose or suggest the above feature of Claim 1.

Therefore, independent Claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Kiguchi, and Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Kiguchi. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Claims 6 and 29

The Examiner also rejects Claims 6 and 29 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiguchi. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent Claim 1, each of these claims is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 5, 16-17 and 30

The Examiner also rejects Claims 2, 5, 16-17 and 30 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiguchi and further in view of Di Dio (US 2004/0152329), optionally considering Lewis et al. (US 5,272,979). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claim 2 recites the features of “forming a film on an insulating surface;” “horizontally moving a first nozzle and a second nozzle, which are integrated, to a first selected portion of the film with a spacing between the integrated first nozzle and second nozzle, and the film;” and “selectively irradiating the first selected portion with plasma from the first nozzle to form a first groove or a first hole in the first selected portion after the step of horizontally moving the integrated first nozzle and second nozzle.”

As explained above, the Examiner appears to contend that the banks in Kiguchi correspond to a groove or hole. However, the banks in Kiguchi are not formed in a film on an insulating surface, as in Claim 2, but are formed on a substrate. Further, the banks in Kiguchi are formed on a substrate by using an application mechanism. Hence, Kiguchi does not disclose or suggest the above features of Claim 2.

Di Dio (and Lewis) also does not disclose or suggest a groove or a hole formed in a film by plasma treatment.

Therefore, independent Claim 2 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 2 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 23-28

The Examiner also rejects Claims 23-28 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiguchi in view of Di Dio, optionally considering Lewis et al. and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US 7,189,654). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 23 and 26 to recite the feature of “wherein quantity of plasma gas to be irradiated is varied between a vicinity of a region at which the part of the first wiring is formed and the other region.” This feature is supported by, for example, page 22, lines 21-25 in the specification of the present application.

In contrast, Kiguchi, Di Dio and Lewis do not appear to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Therefore, independent Claims 23 and 26 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 23, 26 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Double Patenting

The Examiner further rejects Claims 23-28 on the grounds of non statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-24 of Yamazaki (U.S. 7,189,654) in view of

Kiguchi further in view of Di Dio, optionally considering Lewis et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 23 and 26 to recite the feature of “wherein quantity of plasma gas to be irradiated is varied between a vicinity of a region at which the part of the first wiring is formed and the other region.”

In light of this amendment, it is respectfully submitted that there is no double patenting. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Dated: March 19, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.  
200 West Adams Street  
Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568